THE

REITERATED CHARGES

MADE BY

REV. J. W. CUNNINGHAM,

ANSWERED AND REFUTED,

BY

REV. JAMES A. LYON,

Pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Rogersville, E. Tenn.

JONESBOROUGH, TEN.

PRINTED AT THE "SENTINEL" OFFICE.

1840.

STATEMENT, &c.

Mr. GEORGE REED, believing injustice to have been done to his character, by Mr. Cunningham and Dr. Vance, in their late pamphlet to the public, requests a place in our Reply, for a fair and candid statement of all the facts necessary to a correct understanding of the points in controversy between him and them.

MR. GEORGE REED'S STATEMENT.

In a late pamphlet, published by Rev. J. W. Cunningham and others, it is stated on the 7th page of said pamphlet, that I "*represented this church* (*Bethesda*) *some* 18 *months since in Presbytery at Paperville*," &c.—which fact, as there stated, would seem to imply that I then, by that act, recognised the *existence* of a church, about which, I, eighteen months afterwards, expressed a doubt in my certificate to Mr. Lyon—I therefore feel it due to myself to state the whole facts relative to my attendance at Presbytery on that occasion.

In the spring of 1838, it will be recollected by the reader, that there was great excitement between the Old and New School parties in the Presbyterian church, concerning the acts of 1837, by which the four Congregational Synods were disowned—the New School were determined to nullify that act—the Old School were determined to sustain it—consequently, both parties were anxious to send up a *full delegation* to the General Assembly. That spring, just before the meeting of Holston Presbytery, at which time a delegate was to be sent up to the General Assembly, Mr. Cunningham requested a meeting of our session, which was held in Mr. Embree's meeting house, and consisted of Mr. Thomas J. Brown and myself. Mr. Cunningham at that time stated to us that it was very important for a sacramental meeting to be held at Bethesda for the purpose of building it up, and that we ought to send up a commissioner to Presbytery for the purpose of requesting Presbytery to empower him and Mr. McLin to hold a sacramental meeting there. And although I thought it strange that Messrs. Cunningham and McLin could not hold a meeting for us, especially as they had some time before been employed to preach to us—and as they could do elsewhere without an order from Presbytery—yet I consented to go and make the request. This, to the best of my knowledge, was the first time that ever Bethesda was represented or requested to be represented in Presbytery. I went with Mr. Cunningham to Presbytery. On our way, the subject of sending a delegate to the General Assembly was introduced, and Mr. Cunningham advised me to vote for Mr. Rogan—the man whom it seems the New School had previously fixed upon before the meeting of Presbytery. At Presbytery I requested that Messrs. Cunningham and McLin be appointed to hold a sacrament at Bethesda on the third Sabbath, if I recollect correctly, of August, which appointment was accordingly made. When the time came to hold the sacrament, all necessary arrangements were made,

and the people attended at the meeting-house two days, Saturday and Sunday; but neither Mr. McLin nor Cunningham attended, and we were disappointed—and neither of them ever assigned any reason to me for not attending—and that sacrament was never held.

I attended Presbytery, not because I thought Bethesda had full ecclesiastical existence and was entitled, as other churches are, to a full representation in Presbytery, but to get a sacramental meeting there, as Mr. Cunningham recommended, for the purpose of building it up. But I am constrained to believe, from occurrences that took place at Presbytery, and since that time, that I was taken there for the purpose of electing a delegate to the General Assembly; and if any one chooses to call me *a tool* in this matter, I shall not take it so hard as the *learned* Doctor Vance has done.

Another strong inducement for me to attend Presbytery with Mr. Cunningham, was, that Mr. C. had told me that unless there could be additions to that church, it could not exist—therefore, I was the more anxious to have the sacramental meeting recommended by Mr. C.

It may, perhaps, throw some light upon the state of our church previous to this time to state that, before party matters were talked about, Mr. Cunningham and myself, on the road between my house and Jonesborough, were talking about the state of our church, at which time, Mr. Cunningham advised me for myself, and wife, and others, to connect ourselves with the church at Jonesboro'—to which I replied that Salem church would suit myself and wife better than Jonesboro'—the subject was then dropped. I would also state, that at the meeting of the elders of Bethesda at the time Mr. Vance was sent to Salem Presbytery, that Mr. C. and Vance came to my house, and Mr. C. left Dr. Vance at my house and went after Mr. Brown in order to have a meeting of the session. After they returned, I proposed to them that the remaining members of Bethesda should have letters of dismission if they applied for them, to join other churches—which was rejected by Dr. Vance on the ground that owing to the state of affairs in the Presbyterian church at that time, he thought it better to let Bethesda remain as it was. To the best of my knowledge, this was the *first time* that ever Dr. V. met with the elders of Bethesda in session after he moved to Jonesboro'.

The above facts, and my statements in my explanatory letter published in Mr. C.'s pamphlet, are fully sustained by the statement of Mr. Thomas J. Brown, one of the elders of Bethesda:

"JANUARY 11, 1840. I have been requested to state for what purpose the session of Bethesda church convened at Mr. Embree's meeting house a few days before the meeting of Presbytery at Paperville. The session met at Mr. Embree's at the request of Mr. Cunningham; Mr. Reed and myself only were present, with Mr. Cunningham as Moderator. Mr. C. stated, insisted and requested that this church should send a commissioner to Presbytery to apply to Presbytery to appoint a sacramental meeting, and a minister or ministers to hold it at this church. As well as I recollect, this was the only purpose or subject mentioned which was a very strong inducement for us to send a commissioner.—As to electing a commissioner to the General Assembly, it was never named in session.

I further state that the joint certificate of Mr. Reed and myself was not written in Mr. Reed's presence, but at his house, by Mr. Cunningham. Mr. Reed came home; the certificate was presented to us for signing; Mr. Reed refused to sign as it then was, for it contained things that he could not say whether they were true or false; and after several sentences were struck out, Mr. Reed only agreed to sign it on the condition that they (Mr. Cunningham and Dr. Vance) would print an explanatory letter for him—which they agreed to, if it were sent to them by Saturday.

I do further state that I never told Mr. Cunningham or Dr. Vance that I would sign the certificate, nor would I as it was first presented*; neither did I ever hear Mr. Reed say it was true as it was first presented—but after it was shapen down, he did acknowledge it to be true.

THOMAS J. BROWN."

In order that the public may be enabled to judge of the correctness of Dr. Vance's statement with regard to the joint certificate given by Mr. Brown and myself, I herewith transcribe the following paragraph from Dr. Vance's statement. Dr. Vance says:

"When the above joint certificate was presented to Major Reed, he declined signing it, and intimated that Mr. Lyon had taken the advantage of him, and said if he gave a certificate he wanted to write it himself in his own language. I told him Mr. Lyon had held me up to the public as an impostor, and that I demanded of him and Mr. Brown jointly as Elders, a certificate setting forth by what authority I went to Presbytery, and the situation of the church I represented. He still persisted in his refusal to do me justice, until I told him if he did not sign it, Mr. Brown would, and *would further certify that he (Mr. Reed)* said the certificate was true. He then signed it. The following is his letter, but not written by himself, as the original will testify," &c.

The reader will now compare the two statements. Dr. Vance says: "He (referring to myself,) still persisted in his refusal to do me justice until I told him if he did not sign it *Mr. Brown would.*" Mr. Brown says: "*I never told* Mr. Cunningham or Dr. Vance that *I would sign the certificate, nor would I as it was first presented.*" Again: Mr. Vance says that "Mr. Brown would further certify that he (Mr. Reed) said the certificate was true." Mr. Brown says: "Neither did I ever hear *Mr. Reed say it was true,* as first presented." The reader will now judge from "*the unshaken evidence of Mr. Brown,*" whether the *learned* Doctor's skill in *surgery,* has not succeeded in splintering up the "*Reed broken by its own inherent weakness.*"

Dr. Vance says that I "intimated that Mr. Lyon had taken the advantage of me." This is incorrect—I never intimated any thing of

---

* NOTE. "I gave a statement to Mr. George Reed on the 11th inst., stating that I never told Mr. Cunningham and Dr. Vance that I would sign the joint certificate, nor would I as it was first presented. After signing said statement, and after some reflection, I recollect of telling Mr. C. and Dr. Vance that I would sign it before Mr. Reed pointed out the objectionable places in it. I came to the conclusion that I would not sign it without Mr. Reed would, as we did not know the objectionable places to be so or not, although I did not tell them the state of my mind. If Mr. Reed has my statement of the 11th published, I wish this to accompany it, or strike out the above sentence out of my statement to Mr. Reed.

"Jan. 18, 1840. THOS. J. BROWN."

the kind, but said that if I had known that Mr. Lyon was going to *print* the statement, I should have made it fuller, as I now have made it.

Mr. Vance says in the conclusion of the above transcribed paragraph that my explanatory letter "was not written by me as the original will testify." Although I have not had the advantages in point of education that the *learned* Doctor Vance has had, yet the following certificate of Mr. William Slemons will show that my explanatory letter was my own production:

"I do hereby certify that Maj. George Reed called on me, as I was boarding at that time at his house, and knowing that at that time he was preparing an explanatory letter, stating the facts in regard to the standing of Bethesda church, to copy a letter that had been already prepared for that purpose—that I did so without altering the original in one single sentence as to the meaning of the same—and am well satisfied that the letter published in Mr. Cunningham's pamphlet is a true copy of the original, drawn by Maj. Reed's own hand, and dictated by himself. Given under my hand, this 13th day of January, 1840.

WILLIAM SLEMONS."

I have now given to the public a fair and candid statement of facts, which I deemed due to myself. As it regards Dr. Vance's *angry* and *bitter* attack upon me, I feel disposed to make no comment upon it, but would leave it to the christian world to judge whether such a *spirit* manifested by one elder towards one that he calls a brother elder is in accordance with true christianity, and his professed zeal for promoting the cause of religion.

GEORGE REED.

January 15, A. D. 1840.

MR. LYON'S ANSWER, &c.

Not long since, when I wrote my Defence *against* the charges of "*slander*" and "egregiously foul misrepresentation" made upon me by Rev. J. W. Cunningham, of Jonesborough, and the New School elders of Rogersville, I found it so exceedingly painful and abhorrent to my feelings, to expose a Minister of the Gospel, that I concluded never to allow myself to do it again. And that Ministers of the Gospel, although they be of different parties and denominations, should be engaged in an exterminating war against each other in the presence of a scoffing and gainsaying world, is most deplorable. And it is really surpassingly strange that men of age and experience, such as Mr. Cunningham, Dr. Coffin, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Armstrong and others, would allow themselves to engage and persist in such unhallowed strife, in view of its direful consequences. And here I wish to pause and state as an apology due to those not familiar with the state of affairs in East Tennessee—due to friends abroad, and as an apology due to posterity—that I do consider the controversy in which I have been forcibly *compelled* to engage, *a most disgraceful one*—a controversy beneath the dignity of gentlemen, dishonoring to christians, and in the highest degree disgraceful to clergymen. And nothing distresses me more, than the thought that I have been *compelled*, in order to preserve my character and usefulness, to lay aside that reserve, dignity, and sacredness of character which should be thrown around every Minister of the Gospel, and condescend to a low, disgraceful controversy that approaches almost to *scandal*. And the manner in which I have been compelled so to do, is simply this:—Men of age, learning, standing and influence in society—such men as Rev. J. W. Cunningham, Mr. S. D. Mitchell, Mr. Clinton Armstrong, Rev. Charles Coffin, D. D., and others, have been so overcome by their prejudices and party zeal, as to make all possible efforts to ruin my character and usefulness as a Minister of the Gospel. They have held me up before the world in newspapers, hand-bills and pamphlets, as an "egregiously foul misrepresenter of truth," as one "*branded with the seal of falsehood*," "skulking in darkness," and as one that should be "censured as a slanderer" by my Presbytery, &c., &c. The influence of these men has hitherto been such in East Tennessee, as to blast my character and usefulness forever, unless I defend myself, and show to an impartial public that such astounding charges are unfounded. Hence, I am compelled to engage in a controversy that I consider in the highest degree *disgraceful*, and altogether beneath the calling of clergymen.

And I cannot but think that my assailants also think with myself that the controversy which they have begun and persist in, is disgraceful, from the fact that they manifest great anxiety to get rid of the odium of being the *fomenters* and *accusers* in this controversy, and endeavor to represent me as the "accuser," one "who prefers charges," &c., &c.

I will neither affirm, nor deny—but state the case, and leave the discussion to an impartial world.

Shortly after the meeting and division of Holston Presbytery, the meeting of Synod, and the division of my church as effected by Dr. Coffin and others, all of which took place in the fall of 1838, I wrote a letter to the editor of the "Presbyterian," Philadelphia, on *business*, transmitting to him some money, in which I stated a few facts relative to the state of affairs in East Tennessee. These facts were stated from my own personal knowledge, except one, which was given from report, which was *substantially* true as I shall prove in the sequel. I had *no desire* nor *expectation* that any of these facts should be published.—The letter containing them was a *private* letter, to a *private* friend, and *hastily* written—and if I had once dreamed that any of those facts would have been published, and made the *pretence* for wrapping this part of the country in a disgraceful controversy as they have done, I am very sure they never would have been given from my pen; and sorry I am that any such use has ever been made of them.

The editor without any design to injure any single individual, transplaced most of those facts into the editorial columns of his paper, but in his own hand writing, and with his own responsibility. He was careful to state, however, that the letter from which he obtained those facts, "WAS NOT DESIGNED FOR PUBLICATION." This should have been conclusive evidence to Mr. Cunningham, and every one else, that the author of that letter had no disposition to engage in controversy, or to "prefer" what Mr. C. chooses to call "charges." And I have no hesitation in believing that an impartial public will decide that Mr. Cunningham was not licenced to take any notice of that *editorial* whatever, for the following and other reasons: 1st. The author of the letter had no design to injure any one, nor expectation of a public controversy. 2nd. The facts stated did not involve *moral character*, but were only *examples of party zeal*, and consequently it is incorrect for Mr. Cunningham or any one else to call them "charges." 3rd. There was but *one* of those facts that had reference to Mr. Cunningham. 4th. His name was not mentioned in the editorial, nor any thing else that would have pointed Mr. Canningham out sooner than it would Mr. Carson, who was then laboring in the bounds of the same Presbytery, Mr. Caldwell, or any other New School minister in East Tennessee whose name begins with a C. 5th. The Presbyterian was then scarcely known in East Tennessee. So far as my knowledge extends there was but *four* copies taken in all East Tennessee, at that time, and consequently it was not possible that any facts contained in it would injure Mr. Cunningham. 6th. It was *a disgraceful* thing for a minister of the gospel to attack a fellow-man, and denounce him in the *public prints* as an "egregiously foul misrepresenter of truth," "moral" "assassin," &c. &c. These are some amongst many other reasons that might be given, why Mr. Cunningham was not bound to take any notice of the short *editorial* in the Presbyterian at all. But what did Mr. Cunningham do when he was furnished by some friend, with a copy of the Presbyterian containing this editorial? He observes in it a mistake of *one*, relative to the numerical strength of the two divisions of Holston Presbytery; and thinking he could shield himself, as to other points, behind strict *technicalities*, he immediately seized the weapons of controversey—wrote a long

and impassioned piece for the "Observer & Telegraph," which was extensively circulated in East Tennessee, where Mr. C. and myself were both known—in which he charged the author of the letter to the Presbyterian, whom he chooses to call "a nameless letter-writer," "a nameless correspondent," one who withholds his name," &c., with being an "egregiously foul misrepresenter of truth," "a hideous caricaturer of truth," "a gross misrepresenter of truth," "a moral assassin," &c., &c. And in these astounding charges, he does not confine himself to the *one* fact which alluded to himself—but he goes over the whole ground, charging me with *falsehood in my statements with* regard to the meeting and division of Presbytery, the state of Bethesda —and not only so, but he even comes to my *own door*, and pronounces what I had stated relative to the division of *my own* church "*gross misrepresentation*," although he confesses at the time, that he did not know nor wish to know much concerning the division of this church"!— Now I appeal, without a fear as to the decision, to an impartial world to decide who is the "*accuser*"—who that "*prefers charges*,"—and who the *fomenter* in this unhappy controversy?

Who could have blamed me if I had immediately arisen up to defend myself against these deadly thrusts made at the very vitals of my character? How natural would it have been for me to have endeavored to acquit myself of the odious charge of "slander" and "foul misrepresentation"! But did I do so? When the poisoned lance was hurled, did I hurl it back again? No—far from it.—But I immediately consulted with my fathers and brethren in the Ministry, who were, at the time I first saw that attack, assembled at Presbytery. The unfairness and cruelty of Mr. C's attack were admitted by all—but the harm that a controversy would do to religion, and the excitement it would produce in the community, were taken into consideration, and the conclusion and advice were to *pass the whole in silence*, and take no notice of it. This advice I determined to follow, and gave my attention to my studies and pastoral duties. But my enemies were determined that the matter should not rest here. A few weeks after this, Mr. Cunningham came into the bounds of my own congregation to assist in holding a sacramental meeting for the disaffected portion of my own church—at the conclusion of which a *caucus* was held, as I have been informed, at Mr. Clinton Armstrong's house, *including* Mr. Cunningham, which brought forth a *hand-bill*, "*A Card to the Public*," to be distributed amongst the community, posted up in public places, as one would advertise a *thief*, *a mail-robber*, or *a cut-throat*, in which reference was had to Mr. C's attack upon me in the 'Telegraph & Observer,' and in which I was held up to the community as "*a slanderer*," one "*branded with the seal of falsehood*," and "*skulking in darkness*"!!! And although Mr. Cunningham may not have *written* or *dictated* any portion of that disgraceful billet, signed by Clinton Armstrong, S. D. Mitchell, Jas. J. Wilson, and Robert D. Young, who were formerly Elders in the Presbyterian church of Rogersville, yet it was produced by the *caucus* of which he was a part, as I have been informed, drawn up under his own eye, and with his *silent*, if not expressed approbation.

This was the *second* public attack upon my character. It was not possible for me to remain silent any longer. I was called upon by my people and all friends to defend myself. I did so. I wrote to my people

a letter defending myself against these bold and repeated charges of "slander" and "foul misrepresentation, which letter was published in a pamphlet. Here I hoped the matter would rest, especially as my antagonist made such extraordinary pretensions to *piety*, and had published to the world this his prayer: "O Lord of Zion, put an end to all strife and contention between the two divisions of our once happy communion. Let not Ephraim envy Judah nor Judah envy Ephraim any longer"!! I thought surely that as "holy," "perfect" and "meek" a man as Mr. Cunningham represents himself to be, would have been found complying with the injunctions of the Gospel, which says, "Blessed are the *peace-makers*, for they shall be called the children of God"—"love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which dispitefully use you and persecute you"—"resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also"—and the Apostle Paul, who did not pretend to be an "evangelizer of the *whole* world" but only of the "Gentiles," said, "being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat; we are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things until this day."

But my expectations, if indeed I had any, founded upon Mr. Cunningham's extraordinary piety, that the controversy would cease, were disappointed. My "*Defence*" is no sooner published than the din of war is heard resounding and re-echoing through the hills and mountains of East Tennessee. Expresses are sent to Greeneville, Rogersville, Kingsport, Blountville, Elizabethton, &c., collecting in the munitions of war. All the *talent* and *learning* in East Tennessee are called into requisition. At the end of *four* months a pamphlet is ushered into existence consisting of 37 dense solid pages, backed by all the force of *titles*, *office*, *age*, *learning* and *great names!*

The authors of this pamphlet are Rev. John Whitfield Cunningham, *late Professor in Hanover Theological Seminary*, Mr. James Harvey Vance, *Doctor of Medicine*, and "Elder in Bethesda church, although he now resides five or six miles from its immediate site,"! the *venerable* Charles Coffin, *Doctor of Divinity*, former *President* of Greeneville College, and late *President* of Knoxville College, E. Ten., Mr. Stokely Donalson Mitchell, *Ex-Clerk* of the Legislature and *Cashier* of Rogersville Bank, Mr. Clinton Armstrong, *Merchant*, Mr. James J. Wilson, *Choirister*, and Mr. Robert D. Young, *Justice of the Peace!*

The above are the ostensible authors of this late pamphlet published against me. I do not append their *titles* from any *ironical* motive, but to inform the public abroad, and posterity, what have been the *standing* and *influence* of my assailants in East Tennessee, which will afford an additional apology for having engaged in a controversy that is most certainly disreputable. And surely, if *numbers*, *titles* and *great names* are sufficient to put down "*a young man*," a "*Juvenile Reformer*," it will be utterly vain for me ever to attempt to defend myself more. But I thank a kind Providence that I live in a land where titles and great names cannot set aside truth and justice; and therefore I feel emboldened, as I feel conscious truth and right are on my side, to proceed to this my second Defence.

I. The first fact stated in the 'Presbyterian' is in the following words: "At the meeting of Holston Presbytery, the New School were to the

Orthodox as 12 to 9." This I freely acknowledged was a mistake, originating in the first place from the fact that all the *test* votes in Presbytery stood 12 to 9—as the records of Mr. C's own Presbytery will show. In the second place, on the first printed page of the pastoral letter of Holston (O. S.) Presbytery, it is stated that the division stood "12 to 9." This was my authority when I wrote to the editor of the Presbyterian. Mr. Cunningham enumerates this mistake amongst what he calls my "egregiously foul misrepresentations," and contradicts it simply by saying, "the records of Presbytery say 13 to 9," omitting to inform the public that the Moderator who *did not vote*, was a New School man, and made the *thirteenth*. I will leave it to an unprejudiced public to decide whether, if Mr. C. had any desire to have given a fair and just representation of the fact, he would not have explained the mistake by stating that the Moderator *who did not vote*, was also a *New School* man—But instead of explaining this mistake, as truth and justice required him to do, he introduces *two* certificates—and to prove what? Not that *the Moderator voted*—for they both testify unequivocally that *he did vote*—but they prove that Mr. King, the Moderator, was a *New School man*, which no one ever dreamed of denying, and which the records of Presbytery would have shown to any one who might inspect them, without the aid of *two* certificates to prove it.

II. The second fact stated in the 'Presbyterian' is in the following words: "Thus one of them (the New School majority) was an elder who represented a church that was *entirely extinct*; and who had not lived even in the neighborhood of its former site for two years!" This statement is *strictly* and *literally* true, as I shall prove to the entire satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind. And here is the proof:

1st. Shortly after this little church Bethesda was organized, many of its leading members moved away, some to Georgia, some to Jonesborough, some to Greeneville, and perhaps some went back to the world again; and Mr. Cunningham and Mr. McLin, who were employed for one year to preach every alternate Sabbath for a certain stipulated sum, preached *only a few times* each, and never called upon the remaining fragments of the congregation for their salary. Does not this fact prove, that these gentlemen considered this church, which was *very small* at first, as broken up?—otherwise, how could they violate their engagement, and instead of preaching *one year*, preach only *a few times* each?

2d proof. Mr. Cunningham himself, before "party matters" were talked about, acknowledged this church to be extinct, as will appear from Mr. Reed's statement. Mr. Reed says: "Before party matters were talked about, Mr. Cunningham and myself, on the road between my house and Jonesborough, were talking about the state of our church, at which time Mr. Cunningham advised me for myself and wife, and others, to connect ourselves with the church at Jonesborough, to which I replied that Salem would suit myself and family better than Jonesborough." This fact proves incontestably that Mr. C. himself considered this church *extinct*—otherwise, with what consistency or justice, could he, calling himself "a constitutional Presbyterian," advise its members to join his own church at Jonesborough? And yet Mr. C. can denounce me in the public prints, as an "egregiously foul misrepre-

senter of truth," for stating in a private letter that this church was "*extinct*"!

But when some party purpose was to be accomplished in Presbytery, some considerable time after Mr. C. had acknowledged this church to be extinct, he could not only recognize its ecclesiastical existence, but *ride* some 8 or 10 miles to Mr. Embree's meeting-house, and *request* to moderate its session for the purpose of obtaining a commissioner from that church, which never had been represented before, to go to Presbytery!—and for what? *Secretly* for the purpose of electing a New School delegate to the General Assembly—but ostensibly for the purpose of requesting Presbytery "to empower Mr. Cunningham and Mr. McLin "to hold a sacramental meeting at Bethesda. Why could not Mr. C. hold this meeting without an order from Presbytery? He could preach elsewhere without an order from Presbytery—he had held a sacrament for this same people before without any order from Presbytery—he had even organized the church, I presume, without any order from Presbytery—but now he must ride some 8 or 10 miles, and with great difficulty get Mr. Reed and Mr. Brown together, and moderate them for the purpose of getting one of them to leave his family and business and ride 35 or 40 miles to attend Presbytery, to request that body to "empower" Mr. Cunningham to hold a sacrament for that people, in a "constitutional" way—just as though it was not as "constitutional" for Mr. C. to hold a meeting for the church that he himself had organized, without an order of Presbytery, as it was for him to ride some 8 or 10 miles in order to *moderate* two elders as the session of Bethesda, *at his own request*, without an order from Presbytery, or the *invitation* of the so called session so to do! See the "*constitution*," (Form of Gov. ch. ix, sec. 4:) "When, therefore, a church is without a pastor, the moderator of the session shall be either the Minister *appointed* for that purpose *by the Presbytery*, or one *invited by the session* to preside on a particular occasion." It is a singular fact that this "sacramental meeting" which Mr. C. took so much pains to have himself "empowered" to hold, in "a constitutional" way, *was never held!!*

3d proof that Bethesda was extinct. Some time last August a sacramental meeting was held there, the first that had been held there for years, and I presume without any order from Presbytery, at which it was resolved by the remaining members of Bethesda and the disaffected of Salem to constitute a new church in connexion with the "constitutional General Assembly," to be called "Mount Lebanon"—which facts must prove to every unprejudiced mind, that Bethesda was considered by all concerned as *extinct*. Here is the subscription paper:

"We whose names are hereunto subscribed, agree to pay the sums annexed to our names, when called on, to the following individuals, as trustees, viz: Elijah Embree, Isaac Taylor, John Bottles, Bird Brown, and Alfred E. Jackson, for the purpose of erecting an edifice to be devoted to the worship of the living God, in connection with the constitutional General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. The house to be located on Chucky river, on the farm of Samuel G. Bayles, Esq.—Witness, our hands, this 19th of August, 1839.

(*Subscribers Names:*)

J. H. & D. G. Vance, (lumber,) - - $50

John W. Cunningham, - - 20
Thos. J. Brown, - - - - - 35 and others."

But lest there should be any quibble with regard to the meaning of the above subscription paper, I herewith give the statement of one of the very leading men in getting up this new church, who is a warm *New School man*, and has hitherto been *a warm friend* of Mr. Cunningham; but who is, nevertheless, an honorable, high-minded man, and has independence enough to speak the truth, even if his own party should be exposed by it. He says:

"The facts with regard to the building of the new church are these: A sacramental meeting was appointed at Bethesda, I think in August, when a meeting of the members of that church, and the disaffected members of Salem church, was called to take into consideration the propriety of building up that church or fixing upon some other location that would be more desirable. Finally, it was concluded to locate it near Samuel G. Bayles', *and it was understood* (italics ours) *that the church was to be* RE-ORGANIZED *by the election of new church officers.* The church is to be called Mount Lebanon, instead of Cedar Hill.—This statement is for your own information, and I would not wish my name used in any answer you may make to Mr. Cunningham."—

Here is positive proof. 1. That it was resolved by the fragment of Bethesda and the "disaffected of Salem" to organize a new church. 2. In connexion with the constitutional General Assembly. 3. The house to be located some two miles and a half from the site of Bethesda, on Chucky river. 4. To be called "Mount Lebanon," which is incontestable proof that Bethesda was *extinct*—And not only so, but that it was *so considered* by Mr. J. H. and D. G. Vance who subscribed *fifty dollars* in lumber—by Mr. Thomas J. Brown who subscribed thirty-five dollars, and Mr. Cunningham who subscribed twenty dollars. And yet Mr. Cunningham and Dr. Vance have denounced me in the public prints as an "egregiously foul mirepresenter of the truth," and as a "*foul mouthed calumniator*" for stating in a private letter that Bethsada was "*extinct!*"

Mr. C's statement in the "Telegraph & Observer" is in the following language: "This church (Bethesda) still exists—has a church—*three* ruling elders—and from 16 to 20 communicants; and Dr. Vance is a member of this church and its regularly appointed delegate, although he now resides five or six miles from its immediate site." This is Mr. C's statement to an editor at Philadelphia. But when a strict inquiry is made into the correctness of his statement, he is compelled to count individuals, members, and elders in that church, who had not been *residing in its bounds for years!* Thus Wm. K. Vance, and family had been residing in Greeneville, more than twenty miles distant, and were members of Greeneville church. Dr. Vance and family had been living in Jonesborough, and were worshipers and supporters in the church there!* If the reader wants proof of these facts, let him consult Mr.

*Perhaps I should not pass unnoticed a statement Mr. Cunningham makes on the authority of the New School elders of Rogersville, namely: "That I considered an individual who had been for years residing in the state of Misouri in good faith a member of this church and actually made this member vote when in Missouri!" This statemnet is *positively, absolutely* and *unequivocally* incorrect, and has not even the least *shadow* of a foundation for *truth*, as the records of our church will show.

Thomas J. Brown's certificate, in Mr. Cunningham's late pamphlet. But for the sake of denouncing me an "unworthy misrepresenter of truth." Mr. C. counts these families in good faith members of Bethesda church! What device will Mr. C. invent to shield himself from the imputation of stating what was incorrect? Perhaps he will assume "constitutional" ground, and say those families were never *formally* and *regularly* dismissed from Bethesda to join the churches at Jonesborough and Greeneville. If this would be the plea, we would ask whether it be consistent with "constitutional presbyterianism" thus to allow the members of one church to wander off some twenty-five miles into the bounds of other churches, without giving them certificates of dismission? But let us admit this plea of Mr. Cunningham's and Doctor Vance's, which is the only thing that will shield them from the imputation of wilful misrepresentation, and I greatly fear this will not shield them, in that Mr. C. *did not inform* the public when he wrote to the editor at Philadelphia, that he counted families that had been worshipers and supporters in *other churches* for years, as *members* of Bethesda church. But admitting all that is claimed, namely that these families were members of Bethesda because they had never received *formal* and *regular certificates* of dismission to join other churches. Now I will prove that Wm. K. Vance and family, Doct. James H. Vance and family, and Thomas J. Brown, *were never members of Bethesda* at all!! How so? Answer. They never were dismissed from the churches to which they previously belonged before they joined Bethesda. These are astounding facts, but I am fully prepared to prove them. And first with regard to Wm. K. Vance and family, the Rev. F. A. McCorkle, the pastor of the church at Greeneville, informed me in a letter dated "Greeneville, Jan. 8, 1840. that Mr. Wm. K. Vance and family never received *formal certificates of dismission* from that church where they belonged, to join Bethesda, or any other church. This letter is still in my possession, and can be seen by any one who may have curiosity enough to inspect it. So that Wm. K. Vance's family according to Mr. Cunningham's doctrine, never were members of Bethesda.

Next, I will prove that Thomas J. Brown another elder, was never a member of Bethesda, because he never was dismissed from Salem church, where he originally belonged, but strange as it may seem, he was a *member and supporter* in the Salem church at the *very time* Mr. Cunningham ordained him an elder in Bethesda church. And here is the proof, the certificate of a *New School* man.

SALEM CHURCH, DECEMBER 16, 1839.

Application having been made to ascertain whether or not Mr. Thomas J. Brown was ever regularly dismissed as a member, from this church—to which I answer: Mr. Brown attached himself to this church some years since, and remained in that connexion until a church was organized in the neighborhood where he lives, to which he attached himself. It does not appear from the records of this church, that any formal dismission was ever called for.

G. W. TELFORD, *Clerk of the Session.*

And Mr. E. L. Mathes, another elder in Salem church also says: "It is evident that he (Mr. Brown) was a member, and a supporter of the

gospel here, at the time he was ordained an elder in Bethesda church.

The above proof not only shows the grossest *irregularity* in Mr. Cunningham's conduct, but the great *inconsistency* of the man, to say the very least, in calling individuals and families who were *living*, and worshiping, and supporting the gospel in the bounds of other churches, members of Bethesda, because they had never received *formal* certificates of dismission from that church to join others, when at the same time he knew perfectly, that these same families and others in that church never had been *formally* dismissed from the churches to which they previously belonged, to join Bethesda.

III. The third fact stated in the 'Presbyterian' has reference to the elder who represented the extinct church, and "*who had not lived even in the neighborhood of its former site for two years.*" This is *literally* true, and needs no proof. Dr. Vance is and has been for years a citizen of Jonesborough, residing in the heart of Hebron church. But how does Mr. C. answer this part of the statement? I say "Mr. Vance had not lived even in the neighbrhood of its former site for two years." Mr. C. writing to the editor of the 'Telegraph & Observer' at Philadelphia states, "that Dr. Vance is a member of this church, although he now resides five or six miles from its immediate site." What impression will this convey to the mind of the Editor at Philadelphia, and all readers who are not citizens of Jonesborough and its vicinity? Most evidently this—that Dr. Vance still resides in the bounds of this church, although at some distance from its edifice. Does not this bear evident marks of what Mr. C. calls "wilful misrepresentation"? Mr. Paley says: (see Moral Phil. b. iii. ch. xv.) "*It is the wilful deceit that makes the lie*, and we wilfully lie when our expressions are not true in the sense in which *we believe the hearer to apprehend them.*" The judge will charge his jury—"If the witness do not speak the *whole truth*, but *omit* part, which omission conveys a wrong idea, his testimony is *false*; it is not to be relied on."

But I will go a step farther in Dr. Vance's case, and prove not only that he did not reside in the bounds of Bethesda, which is notorious, but that he was practically, to all intents and purposes, a *member* of the church at Jonesborough, at the very time he represented the extinct church of Bethesda in Presbytery, and here is the proof:

1st. Dr. Vance had been residing for years in the town of Jonesboro', in the heart of Mr. Cunningham's congregation.

2d. Dr. Vance and his family were habitual worshippers and attenders upon the ordinances of religion in Jonesborough church.

3d. Dr. Vance was a SUPPORTER of the pastor of the Jonesborough church, at *the very time*, too, he represented Bethesda in Presbytery.—It is plainly evident, therefore, that Dr. Vance was, to all intents and purposes, a *member* of the church at Jonesborough.

The only explanation that Mr. Cunningham gives of this matter is, that Dr. Vance never received *a formal certificate of dismission* from Bethesda, to join Jonesborough church. But the reader will perceive that this is taking refuge behind a *technicality*, a mere *form*. And, moreover, if these gentlemen insist upon a rigid interpretation of the formalities of our church in this matter, it will, or has been seen, demolish their church, root and branch. It will exclude Wm. K. Vance, one

of its elders, and his family—it will exclude Thos. J. Brown, another elder—and not only so, but it will exclude Dr. Vance himself; for he never received a *formal certificate of dismission* from the church at Greeneville, where he originally belonged, to join Bethesda. This will appear from the following statement of the Rev. F. A. McCorkle. When I heard that Dr. Vance had never been regularly dismissed from Greeneville church, I wrote to the pastor of that church, a warm *New School man*, and also the *brother-in-law* of Mr. Cunningham and Dr. Vance, inquiring whether Dr. Vance had ever been "*formally dismissed*" from that church to join Bethesda. After some considerable time I received an answer from Mr. McCorkle, informing me that neither Dr. Vance nor Wm. K. Vance and their families had ever received *written certificates* of dismission from Greeneville church, but concluded his letter with this singular paragraph:

"I view Dr. J. H. Vance as really and "*formally dismissed*" from this church, not by a written but by a verbal certificate to join Bethesda, or whatever church he might choose to join.

F. A. McCORKLE."

This is the statement of Dr. Vance's and Mr. Cunningham's brother-in-law. A "verbal certificate to join Bethesda or whatever church he might choose to join,"! is something that never was heard of before. It is not only grossly irregular, especially for "constitutional Presbyterians," but it is an absurdity scarcely equalled by the story of Baron Munchausen's horn, in which the sound all froze up one cold day, and *blew out* again at night in a warm room.

Dr. Vance, therefore, was never "constitutionally" dismissed from the church at Greeneville, and according to his own doctrine, is still a member there. And the dilemma stands just thus:—If Dr. Vance was *not* a member of Jonesborough church, where he had been residing, worshipping, and supporting the Gospel for years, because he was never *regularly* and *formally* dismissed from Bethesda—then to apply the same rule, Dr. Vance was never a member of Bethesda, because he was never *regularly* and *formally* dismissed from Greeneville, and the Dr. either represented a church in Presbytery to which he did not belong, but was a member and supporter in another church, i. e. Jonesboro', (which is the true state of the case) or he represented a church which, by his own doctrine was *extinct*, since Wm. K. Vance, an elder, Thos. J. Brown, an elder, and J. H. Vance, an elder, never were regularly and formally dismissed from Greeneville and Salem, and consequently were never *regularly* members of Bethesda—or, in the third place, he represented Greeneville church, which did not belong to the Presbytery. These are the three horns of the dilemma; the Doctor and Mr. Cunningham may seize upon any one they may choose.

I boldly affirm, therefore, that Doct. Vance did represent in presbytery a church which has been proven, was "*entirely extinct*" and this too, whilst he was a member and a *supporter* in Jonesborough church! The fact that Doct. Vance was a SUPPORTER of the church at Jonesborough, *at the time* he went to Presbytery, is an important one and perhaps may need proof, if so, here it is.

"JANUARY, 1840.

"*Rev. Sir*: I received your letter of the 23d December, requesting me to inform you who told me that Dr. Vance was a subscriber to Rev. J. W. Cunningham for his ministerial services in Jonesborough. As well as I recollect, I met with Jesse M. Thompson, a ruling elder in Jonesborough or Hebron church, perhaps in October; I am not certain as to time. After some conversation, the pamphlet war between Mr. C. and Mr. Lyon was mentioned. *We both regretted it had ever taken* place. Mr. Thompson mentioned that Mr. C. convened his session on Monday after their last sacrament, when Dr. Vance came and requested the session to show by their records that he was not a member of that church, and that he was not a subscriber to Mr. Cunningham.—After some conversation Dr. Vance was asked *if* he was not a subscriber last year, (and I think the year before last; as to that I am not certain) to which Dr. Vance answered he was. Mr. Robert McLin then stated that his decision (or opinion) was that if any part of the records went to the public on that subject, the whole should go; that it should be stated that Dr. Vance was a subscriber to Mr. Cunningham last year in 1838, but was not a subscriber this year; at which opinion of Mr. McLin's, Dr. Vance declined receiving the record of the session, except the Clerk's certificate. These are Mr. Thompson's statements to me as well as I recollect.

E. L. MATHES."

The foregoing statement developes *three startling facts*. *1st. That* Dr. Vance was a SUPPORTER of the Jonesborough church at THE VERY TIME he represented the extinct church of Bethesda in Presbytery. 2d. That Dr. Vance required the session of Jonesborough church to certify what was by implication *positively untrue*, and which—to their credit be it spoken, they refused to do. 3d. That Dr. Vance was a *supporter* of his brother-in-law in 1838, but in 1839 he *withdrew his support!* How is this to be accounted for? Did Dr. Vance anticipate that there would be some investigation made as to his attendance at Presbytery?

The conclusion of the whole matter is this: One of the majority of Holston Presbytery was "an elder who represented a church that was entirely extinct, and who had not lived even in the neighborhood of its former site for two years." And yet, for making this statement in a private letter to a friend, I have been denounced by Mr. Cunningham, Dr. Vance, and others, as a "slanderer," an "egregiously foul misrepresenter of truth," "a foul-mouthed calumniator," &c.!!

Mr. Vance insinuates that I denied the *formal* regularity of his appointment, which is altogether incorrect. So far as simple *form* was concerned, I had no doubt but that a *farcical* meeting of the session had been held, and that Dr. Vance had been "in due form" appointed to attend Presbytery. For it seems, from Mr. Reed's statement, that Mr. Cunningham, on that occasion, without any *order* of Presbytery, or *invitation* from the session, as the "*constitution*" required, got on his horse in company with Mr. Vance, and rode out to Mr. Reed's; then Mr. C. left the Doctor, and went in search of Mr. Brown, another elder. In the course of the day, he found him, and brought him also to Mr. Reed's. When he got the three there together, he then *moderated* them; previously, however, instructing Mr. Reed to nominate Dr.

Vance to attend Presbytery. And Dr. Vance was elected *unanimously* "in due form," by this "constitutional" session, to attend Presbytery at Salem. And by the way, this was the *first time* that ever Dr. Vance had met with the elders of Bethesda in session after his removal to Jonesborough, as appears both from the statements of Mr. Reed and Mr. Brown; notwithstanding Mr. Cunningham's assertions to the contrary in the certificate he wrote for Mr. Reed and Brown to sign—and which they would not sign "as it was first presented." In that certificate, Mr. Cunningham says for the elders that signed it, "*the latter* (Dr. Vance) *has always acted with us as an elder*,"—whereas, this was the *first time* he had met in *session* with these elders of Bethesda after his removal to Jonesborough.

IV. We shall proceed now to the fourth fact stated in the 'Presbyterian,' which is as follows: "Another of this (New School) majority was an elder which was the only New School man in the church which he pretended to represent. His appointment was the result of management which was disgraceful in the extreme to the parties concerned. The church was vacant, and had but two elders, one of them decidedly orthodox; a New School minister, a Mr. C., requested to act as Moderator of the session; and when the subject of appointing a delegate to Presbytery was brought up, the New School elder voted for himself, and the Moderator gave the casting vote in his favor."

This was precisely the report that reached Presbytery. And it was moreover reported that Mr. Hodge, the other elder, was very much displeased with such management, and was determined to attend Presbytery also himself; and he was confidently expected there. Before I wrote my "Defence, &c." I went into the bounds of that church in order to ascertain what were the real facts of the case, and was desirous of doing Mr. Cunningham all the justice he might reasonably claim. Whilst there, I learned that the above report was not in all respects *literally* correct; and of this I was careful to inform the public, as my letter will show. But at the same time I was fully convinced that the above report was *substantially* true, as I am fully prepared to prove to the entire satisfaction of every one that desires to know the whole truth. Here is the statement of Mr. Samuel Hodge, an elder in that church, which was given before, but as it contains important proof on this subject, as well as needs some explanation, I will insert it once more:

"Hodge's Store, Sullivan co., E. T., May 24, 1839.

"I am an elder in New Bethel church. About the last of August, the Rev. J. W. Cunningham came into the bounds of this congregation, about one month after he had preached to us by the appointment of Presbytery, and appointed a meeting in a certain school house. This visit of Mr. C's was, to the best of my knowledge, without any invitation of the church—at all events, I am certain it was not by the invitation or knowledge of the session as such. Mr. Cunningham came to my house in the evening and took supper. We went to the school-house together, and on the way were talking about having a sacramental meeting. And after sermon, whilst Mr. Gregg, Mr. Cunningham and myself were sitting talking together, Mr. Gregg suddenly, and very

unexpectedly to me, requested Mr. Cunningham to moderate the session. Mr. C. then asked me if I had any objections. Not knowing the object or design of the meeting, I answered that I had none. I did not request Mr. Cunningham to sit as Moderator. Mr. C. then nominated Mr. Gregg as a delegate to Presbytery, and Mr. G. agreed to go; and then Rev. C. appointed me alternate. Seeing that remonstrance would have been fruitless, since Mr. C. and Mr. G. were both in favor of Mr. G's going, I did not offer any serious objections, but tacitly acquiesced in the measure. I have every reason, that circumstances can afford, to believe that this matter was made up before they came to the school-house. SAMUEL HODGE."

This statement proves—1st. That this meeting of the session that night in the school house was an *unexpected* occurrence to Mr. Hodge. 2. That it was called without previously *consulting* Mr. Hodge, the other elder. 3. That Mr. C. did not leave the appointment to the two elders themselves, but that he *nominated* Mr. Gregg to go to Presbytery, which was *virtually* voting for him. 4. That Mr. Gregg, without hesitation, *agreed to go;* which was *virtually* voting for himself. So that the statement in the Presbyterian—"the New School elder voted for himself, and *the moderator gave the casting vote* in his favor" —is *substantially* true, as every candid mind will no doubt decide.

But the reader will be surprised to learn that all this management was *previously made up* between Mr. Gregg and Cunningham, before they met that night in the school house, as Mr. Hodge intimates in the concluding clause of his statement, where he says—"*I have every reason that circumstances can afford, to believe that this matter was made up before they came to the school house.*" This I am prepared to prove.

Not long since, I visited Mr. Gregg, the New School elder, for the purpose of learning all the facts of the case. I took with me Mr. Francis Hodge, who paid strict attention to the conversation between Mr. Gregg and myself. So soon as the conversation was ended, I went to Mr. Hodge's house, and wrote the substance of it down, which I read to Mr. Hodge, and received his certificate as to its correctness.—From this conversation between Mr. Gregg and myself, which I herewith insert, precisely as it was originally written down and certified to by Mr. Hodge, the reader will learn the following facts relative to this mysterious night-meeting of the session. 1st. It was *previously made up* between Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Gregg, whilst *at Beaver creek camp-meeting*, to have a meeting of the session that night in the school house. 2d. The design of this meeting was to elect Mr. Gregg, the New School elder, to Presbytery. 3d. Mr. Cunningham *proposed* to Mr. Gregg to have this meeting under the pretence of making some arrangements relative to a sacramental meeting—(which was no other than *requesting to moderate the session;* for Mr. C. knew very well that no other minister would be there that night to moderate the session but himself.) 4th. And that it was agreed beforehand that Mr. Gregg should go. The following is the conversation alluded to.

"On Monday, the 13th of January, I called on Mr. James Gregg, and requested him to state the facts relative to the meeting of the session of New Bethel church, in the School house, at which time he

(Mr. Gregg) was appointed to attend Presbytery at Salem in the fall of 1838.

Mr. Gregg stated that he and Mr. Cunningham had been conversing, whilst at Beaver creek camp meeting, on the subject of having this church represented in Presbytery, and that Mr. C. urged the importance of the measure, but he did not recollect *exactly* which introduced the subject.

Mr. Gregg further stated that Mr. Cunningham proposed to him to have a meeting of the session that night for the purpose of making arrangements relative to holding a sacramental meeting, and that it was their expectation there would be a meeting (of the session) that night. Mr. Gregg also stated that Mr. C. and himself had been talking about the propriety of his (Mr. Gregg's) attendance at Presbytery; and he supposes Mr. C. expected he would go; and so far as his recollection serves him, it was Mr. C. that nominated him to go to Presbytery.

Mr. Gregg furthermore stated that it had been his intention to attend the meeting of Presbytery, and that he desired the meeting of the session that night in order that the delegate might be regularly appointed. Mr. Gregg also stated that he was fully aware that Mr. C's preaching in this church in July was by the appointment of Presbytery, but as he did not know what the minute of Presbytery was on the subject, he was not aware that Mr. C's preaching on Monday night in the school house as he returned from Beaver creek camp meeting was by the order of Presbytery.

Mr. Gregg, in the conclusion of the conversation, said that this church had always been Old School until the General Assembly disowned the four Synods, and that it was still Old School so far as doctrine was concerned."

"I was present during the above conversation between Mr. Gregg and Mr. Lyon, which was written down and read to me in two hours after it took place, and would certify that to the best of my knowledge the above is strictly a correct representation of it.

FRANCIS HODGE, Jr."

From the foregoing evidence, we learn the following facts: 1st. This night meeting of the session in the school house was devised and arranged by Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Gregg at Beaver creek camp meeting for the purpose of electing Mr. Gregg, the New School elder, to Presbytery. 2. That it was Mr. Cunningham *proposed* to Mr. Gregg to have this meeting of the session that night. 3d. This was done without *consulting* Mr. Hodge, the other elder, or allowing him to know any thing about their designs. 4th. After the plan was laid, and the arrangements made, Mr. Cunningham moderated the session by the *alone* request of Mr. Gregg, Mr. Hodge not dreaming that a meeting of the session was expected. 5th. Mr. Cunningham *appointed* Mr. Gregg to go to Presbytery, and Mr. Gregg *agreed* to go. 6th. And finally, that this church had always been *Old School* until the disowning act, and that it was still Old School in doctrine.

Now, I leave it to the decision of an impartial public to decide whether the statements in the Presbyterian are not *substantially* true; and whether or not the appointment of this New School elder was not

the result of management which was disgraceful in the extreme to the parties concerned.

Mr. Cunningham, writing to the editor of the 'Telegraph & Observer' says the statement in the 'Presbyterian' is "*untrue* in the *extreme.* I visited (says he) that church, and preached to it by the appointment of my Presbytery, made for *me* at the request of its so called Orthodox elder, who requested me by name. I moderated the session at the *joint request of both its elders.*" But Mr. Hodge says unequivocally "*I did not request* Mr. Cunningham to moderate the session;" and how was it possible that Mr. Hodge should request Mr. C. to do so, *when he never* once dreamed that a meeting of the session was expected or contemplated? And yet Mr. Cunningham, in view of this fact, and in view too of the management of which he was the author to have a meeting of the session that night, can write to a Philadelphia editor, pronouncing my statement "*untrue* in the *extreme*," and declare that he "moderated the session at the *joint request of both its elders*"!

But the most important discrepancy between Mr. Cunningham and these elders relates to the manner in which this night meeting in the school house was held. Mr. Cunningham informs the editor that he "visited that church and preached to it by *the appointment* of his Presbytery" at the time he moderated this session. Mr. Gregg says "he was not aware that Mr. C's preaching in the school house as he returned from Beaver creek camp meeting was by the order of Presbytery." Mr. Gregg elsewhere states that "Mr. Cunningham preached at New Bethel church some time in July, 1838"—and that this night meeting was "about the last of August (as he thinks)." Mr. Hodge says—"About the last of August, the Rev. J. W. Cunningham *came into* the bounds of this congregation *about one month after* he had *preached to* us by *the appointment* of Presbytery, and appointed a meeting in a certain school house." This statement of Mr. Hodge is strictly true.—And yet Mr. C. informs the editor that this night meeting in the school house, as he returned from Beaver creek camp meeting, and which Mr. Gregg says was made "at the request of himself and several other members of the church," (see Mr. Gregg's certificate to Mr. C.) "was by the *appointment* of Presbytery"!!

But how does Mr. Cunningham get out of this difficulty? He attempts to do it, I am sorry to say, by the most *thread-bare quibbling.*—He makes a great noise, and brings forth the minute of Presbytery, set forth in *flaming capitals;* and not only so, but, ridiculous as it may seem, he sends those minutes more than 20 miles distant to get a man to *certify* that they *were the minutes* of Presbytery!! And after all the noise he has made about the minute of Presbytery, what is it? Here it is, flaming capitals and all:

"Ordered, that Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Lyon each supply one Sabbath at New Bethel, (AND AS OFTEN AS THEY CAN, AT DISCRETION,) before our next meeting."

What, now, does this prove? It proves simply that Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Lyon were *ordered* to supply ONE Sabbath each, and allowed PERMISSION to go and preach there afterwards if we chose. This is the true and *only* meaning of the minute. The parenthetical clause, ("as often as you can, at discretion") is *no order* at all, as is palpable to every reflecting mind, but only a *permit* to go and preach

there if we could. And this too is in strict accordance with rigid Presbyterial discipline; for, according to the order of our church a minister is not allowed to go and preach to a vacant church without the *invitation* of the church, or the *permission* of Presbytery. Mr. Cunningham therefore *did not* preach that night in the school house as he returned from Beaver creek camp meeting, "by the *appointment* of his Presbytery," as he informed the editor at Philadelphia. It is perfectly evident that this appointment was fulfilled in July, and that Mr. Cunningham was under no further *obligations* to preach to that people. And will not an impartial public decide that Mr. C. was fully aware of all these facts? Hence his *noise*, *flaming capitals*, *certificates* and *quibbling* about this matter. How much more commendable it would have been, if he had come out and acknowledged frankly that his statements on this subject were *incorrect!*

V. The next fact mentioned in the Presbyterian concerns the division of Rogersville church, in which the venerable Dr. Coffin is deeply implicated. I will therefore say nothing about this part of the statement, as it will be fully and satisfactorily treated of in a pamphlet that will soon be published by individual members of the congregation of Rogersville.

I would only remark, however, on this head, that Mr. Cunningham has taken it upon himself to *contradict* every thing I stated relative to the division of my church. He says, "I do know it to be gross misrepresentation," and what is rather singular, he confesses at the same time that "he did *not know* much, nor wish to know much concerning *the division of this church*"! In answer to this, I stated that Mr. C. was familiar with the facts concerning the division of my church; that he was *present* in Rogersville at the *very time* it took place—that he was a member of Presbytery that received the "petition and protest" emanating from the Bank, which were the wedge and the hammer that divided my church—and not only so, but Mr. Cunningham is the *stated clerk* of the same Presbytery and had in his hands at the very time he wrote the above assertion this same "petition and protest," and all the papers relating to the case—and yet this gentleman informed the public through the columns of the 'Telegraph & Observer' "that he does not know nor wish to know much concerning the unhappy division of this church"!!

I further stated in my Defence that Mr. C. was not only privy to the origin of our troubles, but that he was the *instigator* of them, and a great accessory to the division of my church. He was the instigator, in that he unwarrantably interfered in both my congregations, by *secretly*, without my *knowledge* or *advice*, obtaining subscribers amongst my people for a furious New School paper. As these are important facts, I will accompany them with their proof. The following is the statement of the session of New Providence church:

"A few months after the General Assembly had disowned the four Synods—at a time, too, when our congregation was peaceful, united, and harmonious, the Rev. J. W. Cunningham came into our midst during the sessions of Holston Presbytery, of which he was then a member—made very exciting speeches in the presence of our people against the Old School party; and during the intervals of the meeting was engaged—although without the knowledge of our pastor, and some of the lead-

ing men of this congregation, whose duty it would have been to have warned their people against any thing that would likely create discord, strife, and divisions—in obtaining subscribers for the 'Southern Religious Telegraph,' a paper in the highest degree hostile to the sentiments and preferences of our pastor, and the great mass of our people. And this was the *cause* and *beginning* of strife and discord in our midst.

It is our solemn and deliberate opinion that there never would have been any disturbance in either of the churches over which Mr. Lyon is pastor, if it had not been for the interference and efforts of Rev. J. W. Cunningham and others, by *private conversation, speeches,* and especially by the *circulation of New School newspapers and pamphlets.*—Some of these newspapers were sent to individuals who had *never subscribed* for them, or desired them. Some were sent for less than their subscription price, and some were sent *gratuitously.* To all which, we testify and sign our names.

JOHN YOUNG,
WILLIAM GRAY,
WM. ALEXANDER,
Session of New Providence Church."

There are two facts that should be mentioned in connexion with the above. First. Mr. Cunningham, when *secretly* circulating the Telegraph among my people, *concealed the fact that it was a party paper!* and only represented it as a "*religious paper.*" So that some, at least, of those whom he got to subscribe for the paper, did *not know at the* time that it was a *New School party paper!!* Second fact. Mr. C., in order to facilitate the circulation of this hostile print amongst my unsuspecting people, let them have it for *less than the subscription price!* I now appeal to an impartial world to decide if such conduct as described above, does not deserve the *severest censure,* and whether it does not violate those principles that should govern the *christian* and the *gentleman.*

Mr. Cunningham and his associates endeavor to divert the public eye from this part of his conduct by pretending that he obtained only *one* subscriber for the Telegraph; and this was what "*dethroned*" *me,* &c., &c.—and also represent me as wishing to "*dictate*" to my people, and require them to ask my "*permission*" to take a newspaper or pamphlet &c. This is all a *manœuvre* designed to divert the public eye from beholding *conscious guilt.* I never dreamed of requiring my people to "ask permission of me" to take a newspaper or a pamphlet, no more than I dreamed that any one calling himself a gentleman would come into my congregation and secretly circulate inflamatory papers amongst my unsuspecting people without my knowledge or advice.

These are the unvarnished facts with regard to the troubles and division of my church. And yet this gentleman can write to an editor in Philadelphia and pronounce unqualifiedly that my statements are "a gross misrepresentation," alleging at the same time "that he did not know nor wish to know much concerning the unhappy division of this church"!

Another fact illustrative of the unbounded party zeal of Mr. Cunningham, was his visit to Rocky Spring church in order to prevent it from continuing its connexion with the Old School General Assembly.

This church had always from its first organization, been Old School, but over which Mr. Cunningham was beginning to have some influence. Mr. Cunningham's own account of the matter is this:—When he heard that the Rev. S. W. Doak, the founder of that church had been there, and that an elder had been chosen to attend Presbytery, "When I heard this (says Mr. C.) I went there with the express design of preventing that church from committing an act of self-destruction, by taking a leap in the dark." And he did actually go! and that too, after he had already moderated FOUR other sessions, including one of an extinct church, for the purpose of getting New School elders to Presbytery—he did actually ride some *forty miles* (I was under the impression that Mr. C. had gone the most direct way from Jonesboro' to Rocky Spring, which would have been little more than twenty miles, but he says he went by way of Greeneville, which would make the journey about *forty* miles!) to see a vacant church "for the express purpose" of preventing that church from voting in Presbytery! Does not this betray an astonishing degree of *party zeal*? But this is not all. Mr. C. says he went there with "the express design of preventing that church from committing an act of *self-destruction*," &c. What was this "*self-destruction*"? The reader will be surprised to learn that this "self-destruction" was no other than a *threat* made by Mr. Cunningham to these elders that if they did continue their connexion with the Old School General Assembly, then he and Mr. McLin and the New School preachers that had formerly preached for them occasionally, *would not preach for them any more*, and the church would go to "destruction"! And yet Mr. Cunningham calls himself "An Evangelizer of the world"! But what is still more strange, after Mr. C. had manifested so much anxiety about this little church, and had considered it of so much importance that he rode forty miles to visit it, and labored till a *late hour in the night*, to prevail upon the elders not to vote in Presbytery, but failed in his design, yet in every publication he makes he fails not to speak *tauntingly* and *disrespectfully* of this little church.

There is a serious discrepancy between Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Baxter, one of the elders of this church. Mr. C. says in the Telegraph, that Mr. Baxter "declared again and again that of one thing he was satisfied, that the cutting off of the Synods, &c., was unconstitutional." But unfortunately, Mr. C., in the same paragraph says "that he advised these elders that they had better defer attaching their church to either body until they could be *better informed* and better *satisfied* as to what was their duty." Does not this advice plainly imply that Mr. Baxter's mind was *not* "*satisfied*" that the cutting off of the Synods, &c., was unconstitutional? Most evidently—and sustains Mr. Baxter in saying, "I never said nor believed that the cutting off of the Synods was unconstitutional." And Mr. C. informs us again in his late pamphlet, that when he urged Mr. Baxter not to take a leap in the dark, he replied "but will not the matter be discussed in Presbytery? I was thinking I might then understand the matter." Does not this prove triumphantly that Mr. Baxter's mind was not "*satisfied*" as to the unconstitutionality of the cutting off act? So that Mr. Baxter, by Mr. Cunningham's own testimony, is sustained in his statement.

Mr. Cunningham has introduced one of Mr. John Lynn's certificates on this subject, which proves just about as much as most of the certifi-

cates he has introduced prove, i. e. *nothing*. And here I would take occasion to remark that most of the certificates introduced by Mr. Cunningham are altogether *impertinent*. They either prove nothing, or they prove what was never denied or called in question. For example, one of Mr. Lynn's certificates and that of Mr. Rhea's prove what no one ever dreamed of denying, namely, that Mr. King was a NewSchool man. Mr. John Ryland's proves what had never been thought of before, namely, that Mr. Vance never brought with him a *formal certificate* of dismission from Bethesda to Jonesborough, (but "the wicked flee when no man pursueth.") The certificate of Mr. Griffith Rogan, ridiculous as it may seem, proves that the minutes of Presbytery were *in very deed* the *minutes* of Presbytery!! just as though the minutes could not stand for themselves! 'Tis a wonder Mr. Cunningham did not get some one to *certify* that *he himself* was in *very deed* Mr. Cunningham, *and not another!* Mr. Jonathan King's certificate proves what no one in his senses ever called in question. And another one of Mr. John Lynn's certificates proves that "*perhaps* Mr. Baxter said the cutting off act was unconstitutional"! And Mr. Cunningham has actually given a certificate himself to Mr. Vance, and in return Mr. Vance certifies for him!!

But Mr. Cunningham deserves credit for introducing these certificates, even if they prove nothing. For, in the first place, the careless reader seeing these certificates, will take it for granted that something must be proven. And second, when a man once gives a certificate, *it* will *inlist* him, his friends, and relations, *on the side on which he has certified*. So that this array of *thirteen* certificates is a specimen, if not of generosity towards an opponent, at least of artifice and cunning.

VI. Another fact stated in the Presbyterian, is in the following words: "We have *sixteen* Old School churches and they are the oldest and most *respectable* in East Tennessee." This is strictly true; Mr. Doak in his report, only mentioned those churches which had been represented by their elders in Presbytery, which amounted to 13, not counting at the same time Tazwell, the first church at Knoxville, and others known to be prime Old School, but which have not as yet been represented in Presbytery by their elders—and not only so but we are now ready to organize five or six other churches in connexion with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church—if we only had preachers to become their pastors. Our churches are the "*oldest and most respectable*," in East Tennessee, amongst which are Salem, Leesburg, New Providence, Rogersville, Lebanon, Knoxville, Pleasant Forest, Baker's Creek, &c. &c. And I would further state for the information of the people of East Tennessee, that our Presbytery consists of *nine* ordained ministers of the Gospel—having under their care several candidates—two of which are now pursuing their theological studies at Princeton, New Jersey—and we expect in a short time to receive under our care *seven* or *eight* more candidates for the Gospel ministry—and 'ere long, we shall organize a respectable Synod in East Tennessee.

VII. The only other item in the editorial, that remains to be noticed, relates to the "*Maryvillites*." In every piece published by Mr. Cun-

ningham, he is seen to rehearse the unguarded expression used by me —"the *New Lights* at Maryville are generally *unsavoury even here.*" Why does Mr. Cunningham delight in reciting this to the public? Does he think that he has not succeeded in making me a sufficient number of enemies? Or is this one of his methods of "evangilizing the world?"!! by making enemies instead of friends? Our Saviour says—"Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the children of God." — But this "evangelizer of the world," who has written down his prayer, and sent it forth to be *read* "*of men*" "O Lord of Zion put an end to all STRIFE and CONTENTION between the two divisions of our once happy communion," is careful every publication he makes to rehearse the unguarded expression I made relative to the "Maryvillites"—which can be for no other purpose and can have no other object in view, than to increase the bitterness and number of my enemies. And here let me solemnly declare, that I have heard Mr. Cunningham himself repeatedly make use of similar expressions and *equally disrespectful*, with regard to the same "unsavoury Maryvillites."—and yet, because I unguardedly made use of an expression similar to what I had heard him make use of repeatedly in a *private* letter never "*designed for publication*" he must repeat it every time he comes before the public, in order to make that whole class of individuals in East Tennessee, my most bitter enemies—and yet this gentleman claims to be an "evangilizer of the world"!!!

For what purpose will the public judge, did Mr. Cunningham write the *following* paragraph—"That Mr. Lyon a young man and minister never considered a *reformer* in *humility*, spirituality, meekness, and in speaking the truth in the power and demonstration of the Holy Ghost, to the conscience, of men, should in the outset censure, proscribe, and denounce,so many,and such men as Charles Coffin, D. D., N. S. Beman, D, D., Isaac Anderson, D. D., Rev. Messrs. Barnes, Ross, Converse, &c. &c., reflects no honor either upon his head or his heart." What object think you reader, the pious Mr. Cunningham who professes to be an "evangilizer of the world" had in writing and publishing this paragraph? Was it, think you, to make *peace* and *brotherly love*, which must be the first step towards "evangilizing the world?" I will leave you to answer the question, whilst I would inform the public that I *never did* "censure, proscribe, and denounce such men as Charles Coffin D. D., Isaac Anderson, D. D., and Mr. Ross," but on the contrary, I have studiously avoided saying publicly, any thing against Dr. Coffin., I highly respect Doct. Anderson—and there is no dispute nor animosity between Mr. Ross and myself that I know of, and I hope there will be none, notwithstanding Mr. Cunningham's efforts to make it.

As it regards the flagrant outrage upon society, of being "*a young man,*" with which I have been so repeatedly charged, I presnme as I have no certificate to prove to the contrary, "it would be best publicly to confess, and if the present generation will not *forgive*, perhaps a liberal and enlightened posterity may." As a paliation of this crime, however, I would inform my accusers that it is no fault of mine, it is a misfortune entailed upon me from my parents—and if I mistake not, it is *hereditary* in the family. I will promise my accusers however, that if they will forgive me this once, for being "*a young man!*" I will never transgress on this score again—at all events they may rest assured I

never will be any *younger* than at present if that will be any consolation to them.

Mr. Cunningham brings a grave charge against me of "*mutilating*" the mintutes of Presbytery. He says: "he mutilates the minutes of Presbytery by which I was ordained to preach to New Bethel church, leaving out ('*as often as you can at discretion*') whereas the real truth is, I *never saw* that minute before I saw it in Mr. Cunningham's pamphlet—I never *pretended to quote* that minute—I did not know that such a minute was in *existence*—and astounding as it may seem, *can prove that Mr. Cunningham knew* AT THE VERY TIME *he wrote the above charge*, THAT I HAD NEVER SEEN THAT MINUTE!!! The Old School Presbytery have made repeated efforts to obtain the minutes which the *secession* have taken from them, but they have been as repeatedly refused. They have proposed to let them have the *original* copy if they would bear *half* the expense of transcribing them—this too, they refused. The Old School then have asked the *privilege* of transcribing the minutes all at their own *expense*, but they will not hear even to this, but not only so, some time since I went to Mr. Cunningham requesting *a few extracts* from the minutes of Presbytery relative to the division of my own church. And this favor he *sarcastically* refused to grant! And yet that gentleman can accuse me of of "*mutilating*" the minutes of Presbytery which he knew I had never seen!!

A PARALLEL.—Mr. Cunningham, in many places, assumes to himself peculiar piety and holiness. He applies these scriptures to himself: "No weapon formed against thee shall prosper"—"that they may shoot in secret at the *perfect*." And, indeed, some have *thought* that Mr. C. laid claim to "*inspiration;*" for, in one place he says, "the Lord of Heaven did not speak by Mr. Lyon in his charges and pamphlet,"—which is saying, by implication, that "the Lord of Heaven *did speak* by Mr. Cunningham in his charges and pamphlet"!! And in another place, Mr. C. compares himself to the "*Archangel*"! He says—"Even *Michael*, the *archangel*, when contending with the *Devil*," &c. which is not only comparing himself to the "*archangel*," but unfortunately he compares me to the "*Devil*"! Mr. C. does not content himself with assuming *peculiar sanctity*, but he takes it upon himself to *judge my heart*—which belongs only to Omniscience—and insinuates that I have no religion. In one place, he says, "Mr. Lyon, a young man and minister never considered a *reformer* in *humility*, *spirituality*, *meeknees*, and in speaking the truth in the power and demonstration of the Holy Ghost to the consciences of men," which is saying, by implication, that he is an "*humble*," "*spiritual*," "meek" man, "who speaks the truth in the power and demonstration of the Holy Ghost to the consciences of men," and of course *is not like me!*

Luke xviii. 11. "And the Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, *or even as this publican*."

Again: Matth. xxiii. 3d—"All therefore, which they [the Scribes and Pharisees] bid you observe that observe and do, but do not ye after their works; FOR THEY SAY AND DO NOT." So Mr. C. prays, "O Lord of Zion, put an end to all strife and contention between the two divisions of our once happy communion," and immediately rushes into the very midst of "*strife and contention*," and denounces his brother

minister as "an egregiously foul misrepresenter of truth," a "hideous caricaturer of truth," "a moral assassin," &c., &c.

Again: Matth. vi. 5.—"And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are; for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, *that they may be seen of men.*" Mr. C. writes down his prayers and sends them forth in newspapers and pamphlets *to be read of men!*

Once more: Mr. C. proclaims through pamphlets and newspapers what "*wonders of grace*" have attended his ministry. At New Bethel, under *his* ministry, "*eleven* souls gave hopeful evidence of a change of heart, and were added to the church"—"and Jonesborough, *fifteen* souls,"!! &c. Matth. vi. 2d.—"When thou doest thine alms, do not sound A TRUMPET before thee as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets that they may have glory of men; verily I say unto you they have their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth," &c.

I have not drawn the foregoing *parallel* to *mortify* Mr. Cunningham —by no means—but only to show to a discerning and impartial public the great *inconsistency* of the man, in making such extraordinary pretensions to "piety, "humility," "meekness," "spirituality," &c., when his words and actions are so very diverse from it. Another example of Mr. C's inconsistency in this respect may be seen in the multitude and severity of the *epithets* which he and his compeers have applied to me, which I shall call their "weapons of celestial temper."

Mr. Cunningham speaks of using "weapons of celestial temper." The following is a list of some of those "weapons," extracted from his pamphlet and writings against me. I shall also intersperse a few of Mr. C's prayers and ejaculations as we go along, in order that the reader may see how astonishingly inconsistent he is:

"WEAPONS OF CELESTIAL TEMPER."

"False accusation."
"His censorship."
"Juvenile reformer."
"Utterly devoid of truth."
"Shamefully slandered."
"Falsity."
"Every one false."
"Lordship."
"Extraordinary misrepresentations."
"Foul suspicions."
"False charges."
"Deliberate slander."

PRAYER.—"O Lord of Zion, put an end to all strife and contention between the two divisions of our once happy communion. Let not Ephraim envy Judah, nor Judah envy Ephraim any longer."!!!

"Egregiously foul misrepresentations."
"Hideous caricature of truth."
"Unfounded and unworthy misrepresentations."
"*Untrue* in the *extreme*."
"Wander egregiously from the truth."
"Moral assassination."

"Vindictive spirit."

EJACULATION.—"O, when shall the time return, when

'Each can his brother's failings hide,
And show a brother's love.'"!!!

"Falsehoods."

"Blackest specimens."

"Foul-mouthed calumny."

"Father of this *ill-bred group.*"

"I do not covet the warrior's laurels who has buckled on the harness of theological controversy in this day of our Zion's tribulations. But I do covet the immutable security of him who backbiteth not with his tongue."!!

"*Slanderer.*"

"Reckless assertion."

"Calumnies."

"Skulk in darkness."

"*Branded with the seal of falsehood.*"

"Devil," (by implication.)

"I do from my soul love—yea, venerate—many of my fathers and brethren of the Reformed Assembly. And I hope by the grace of God, to meet them, with harps in hand, on the plains of immortality, and be close seated by their side, and severally commingle our ransomed voices in all the ecstacies of that hallelujah anthem with which heaven's high arches will ring through eternity."!!!

"Low and *ill-mannered.*"

"*Dignified* functionary."

"Braggart ravings."

"A coarse and vulgar heart."

"Untruth of the most hideous form."!!!

The above are a specimen of the "weapons of celestial temper" used by Mr. Cunningham and his compeers in their exterminating war against me. The reader must judge of their "celestial" origin, and especially of their *consistency* with the *prayers* and *ejaculations* of their wielders.

I have now finished my second Defence against the attacks that have been made upon my character. And here I must remind the reader, as I did in the introduction, that I do consider this controversy into which I have been dragged unexpectedly and most sorely contrary to my will, *a most disgraceful controversy;* and nothing distresses me more than that I have been compelled to lay aside that reserve, that dignity, and sacredness of character, which should be thrown around every minister of the Gospel, and condescend to a low disgraceful controversy in order to preserve my character from the devouring attacks of men *far older*, far better known, and far more influential than myself in East Tennessee.

I do consider myself *greatly injured* by my New School brethren. Once my congregations were peaceful, united, happy. But they came into the midst of my unsuspecting people—*secretly* scattered the *firebrands* of discord, and exerted an influence which destroyed the peace and harmony of my charge. But I endeavored to build up the broken down walls, and by the next summer I had a large flourishing Sabbath-school, a large flourishing catechetical class, a periodical lecture to the colored people—in short, I was trying to do all the good I could. But my New School brethren came in the midst of all this—alienated part

of my charge—some of whom were dear—sundered my church, and tore part of my people away from me. But this did not satisfy them. They then *privately* and publicly assailed my character, and held me up in the *public prints* and in *hand-bills* before the world, as "an egregiously foul misrepresenter of truth," as one "*branded with the seal of falsehood*," and as a "*slanderer*." But this is not sufficient. They want to have me *publicly disgraced* by my Presbytery! And Mr. Cunningham, in the last publication he has made, recommends that I should "*be censured by my Presbytery as a slanderer of the Gospel ministry*"!!! But I have no such desires with regard to Mr. Cunningham—but on the contrary, I hope his Presbytery will not notice the difficulty into which he has precipitated himself. I cannot but hope that Mr. Cunningham's attack upon my character was not the result of *deliberation*, but the work of an *unguarded* moment, when his prejudices and party zeal predominated over him—and that he will live to see calmer moments, when he will see his error and be sorry for it. I will therefore *freely forgive* Mr. Cunningham and my New School brethren all the injury they have thought to do me, if they will only consent to let me and my people henceforth live in peace and quietness. Then I will finish the work of pamphleteering for the purpose of doing as much good as God may enable me to do.

JAMES A. LYON,
Pastor of the Pres. Ch. at Rogersville, Ten.

NOTE.—As it regards Dr. Coffin's statement against me in Mr. Cunningham's pamphlet, and the bitter and vindictive piece by the New School elders of this place, I have thought proper to take no notice of them myself. But I would inform the public that an able and most conclusive answer to those statements is prepared, and will soon be ready for the press.